COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. VII. No. 14.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 6, 1805. [PRICE 10D.

"I hope there never will be room for any one to entertain an idea, that ministers are too big for punish-
"ment, and out of the reach of parliament. This house has drawn the line, and I make no doubt but
"those who shall transgress it, will find that parliament does not want power to bring them to punishment,
"let their rank be what it may. It is not, therefore, because the house cannot punish ministers who may
"disobey it, that we extend responsibility to those who may obey the unlawful commands of ministers; but,
"solely because there should not exist a possibility of ministers *first being guilty of disobedience themselves,*
"*and then shifting the blame on the shoulders of their inferiors.*"——MR. PITT'S Speech in the House of Commons, 4th March, 1782.

AFFAIRS OF INDIA.

SIR,——I have attentively read your remarks on the present state of India. In many of your observations I fully agree I will take the liberty to mention certain points, on which I differ from you, and I will endeavour to explain *the causes* to which our present embarrassments in India, ought fairly to be imputed.——I am afraid, Mr. Cobbett, that the actual debts of India, instead of being twenty millions as you state them, are at this moment thirty millions sterling at the least.——In this country we have unhappily been able to borrow money to such an extent, that a debt of thirty millions appears a mere trifle; especially, when it is considered that the revenues of India are *ten millions* a year. But no reasoning can be more dangerous, or more fallacious. The debt of India bears an interest of 12 per cent. or at least, a part of it does, and the remaining part an interest of 10 per cent., which is a deduction of three millions a year, from the Indian revenues, leaving seven millions a year, for the civil, judicial, and military expenses of India, which at present far *exceed* seven millions sterling a year.——If the present system is continued, therefore, so far from India being the brightest gem in the British crown, it will be a severe clog upon Great Britain——You are in an error, Mr. Cobbett, when you impute to the Court of Directors, or to the East India Company any blame, for the measures which have occasioned the present debt. From the year 1784, when Mr. Pitt's bill passed, to this day, the political affairs of India have been under the management of a board of commissioners appointed by his Majesty. That board fixed the civil and military establishments, and appointed the governors of India. Mr. Dundas invariably avowed in Parliament, that as president of the board, he was alone responsible for the good and economical government of India. The merit or demerit therefore, of each important transaction belongs to him to 1801, and from that time to his successor in office, Lord Castlereagh.——Allow me as shortly as it is possible to do it, to contrast the past with the present state of India.—Prior to our territorial acquisitions, the trade from India was carried on by the exportation of bullion from Great Britain.—Since 1765, when we acquired the sovereignty of Bengal, no bullion was sent to India until 1802. The investments of each year were made by the surplus revenues of Bengal, by the very small drafts which the directors permitted their governments to draw upon their treasury in England, and by the sale of exports, which were not very considerable, with two exceptions. In 1770 bills were drawn upon the directors to the amount of one million; and, in 1781, when we were engaged in an arduous contest with France, the Mahrattas, and Hyder Ally Cawny Mr. Hastings was compelled to purchase the investment of that year with borrowed money, and to draw upon the Company for the amount of that investment.——Lord Clive had calculated in 1765, that after paying every expense, there would be a surplus of one million sterling each year in Bengal.——In 1772, Mr. Hastings succeeded to that government. The debt of Bengal was then a million sterling, contracted chiefly by the remittances sent by the Bengal government to Madras, and Bombay, in the three preceding years. This debt he not only paid off, but in 1777, there was a surplus of above a million sterling in the Bengal treasury; and very valuable cargoes were sent every season from Bengal to Great Britain. India at that period, was indeed, the brightest jewel in the British crown.——In 1778, the war with France commenced. It was the great object of France to recover her lost consequence in India. To effect this she sent secret agents to Poona, and to Hyder Ally, prior to the commencement of the war, an official information that she had done so, was transmitted to Mr. Hastings, by Lord Stormont, then the British ambassador at Paris. The Mahratta war was solely occasioned by the noxious endeavour of Mr. Hastings to counteract the schemes of France, and not with a view or a wish to

acquire territorial dominions. The invasion of the Carnatic by Hyder Ally, was also the result of French intrigues, and in the progress of the war, France sent out seventeen sail of the line, and three thousand of her best troops under De Bussy.——We successfully resisted this most formidable confederacy, and at the close of the war, France and Holland had lost all their settlements in India. We had several armies in the field, actively employed for five years, and when peace was concluded throughout India, the whole debt of India amounted to eight millions sterling, while two millions sterling were added to the annual resources of Bengal by Mr. Hastings.——I dare say, Mr. Cobbett, you can remember the difference of opinion which prevailed in England in 1782, as to the origin of the Mahratta war. A secret committee of the House of Commons was appointed expressly to report the origin and the causes of that war; Mr. Dundas was the chairman, and he moved various resolutions tending to show that it was a war of offence, not of precaution and defence. He deprecated the idea of further conquests in India, and trusted that no future governor, after the sense of parliament was known, would endeavour to rival *the Emperor Aurengzebe*; since any addition of territory in India *by conquest*, was contrary to the *honour*, the *policy, and the justice* of Great Britain.——Here, then, you had the political creed of Mr. Dundas. It matters not whether he was right or wrong, in imputing the Mahratta war to Mr. Hastings, or in supposing that *he* wished to extend our dominions in India *by conquest*.——In 1784, Mr. Pitt's bill passed, and under that bill, Mr. Dundas immediately became the minister of India — His first important measure was, to fix the civil and military establishments of India. It had been the fashion to declaim at large upon the supposed extravagance of Mr. Hastings's administration. The strictest attention to economy, was therefore, to be expected from Mr. Dundas. Mr. Hastings had been thirteen years governor general of Bengal. For five years he had to support a war against France, Hyder Ally, and the Mahrattas. This he did support without the assistance of any kind from England, except that in one year he drew bills to the amount of the investment, which in that year he sent home. The debt of *Bengal* did not exceed three millions when he quitted the government, though the whole India debt was eight millions.——What, Mr. Cobbett, is the situation of India at present? The debt is *thirty millions*, and bullion to the amount, I believe, of four millions has been sent to India during the administration of the Marquis Wellesley. But this is not all. The India debt of eight millions which existed in 1784, has in great part been paid off in England. I do not think I exaggerate, therefore, when I say, that the affairs of the Company are worse by thirty millions than they were in 1784.——To what cause are we to attribute this? Is it to the wars in which we have been engaged *since* 1784. I think not. The first war with Tippoo Sultaun was finished in "two campaigns." We acquired twenty lacks of rupees by the peace which Lord Cornwallis concluded with him; besides a very valuable territory; and seventy lacks of rupees paid, the extra expenses of the war. The second war with Tippoo Sultaun was finished in one campaign, by his final overthrow; and our acquisition of his dominions, of which we retained as much as we thought proper.——The extra expenses of the Mahratta war must have been considerable undoubtedly, and the warfare still maintained with Holkar, must occasion heavy extra expenses.——The expedition from Bengal to Egypt was a very heavy extra expense, which fell for the time upon Bengal.—But, Sir, the great cause of the magnitude of the debt, has been the increased expense of the civil, judicial, and financial branches of the governments in India, and the still greater increase of the armies in India.——Prior to the French war in 1778, the establishment of the Bengal army was four companies of artillery, three regiments of European infantry, and twenty-four battalions of Sepoys; each battalion commanded by a captain.—The establishment at Madras was not so considerable, and that of Bombay very trifling.——As there was no longer a French force in India after the peace of 1783. if it had been thought prudent to *revert* to the establishment of 1778, the expenses of India would have been two millions at the least, within its annual resources. All that was necessary if this establishment had been deemed prudent, was to send out two or three thousand recruits to complete our European regiments; and our Sepoy corps might have been augmented to any extent, when the necessity arose for augmenting them. Such I have every reason to believe would have been the plan of the directors, had the management remained *in their hands*.——But, Mr. Dundas thought it right entirely to new model the army in India. The Sepoy battalions became regiments commanded by colonels. Each regiment formed into two battalions, and each battalion had a lieutenant-colonel, and a major, with a certain proportion of captains and

subalterns.—The old establishment of a battalion of Sepoys was a captain commandant, and ten subalterns, that is one officer to each company. Under this establishment our Sepoys faced French regiments, and were equal to any service. I see no objection to the change however, except as to the expense, which certainly is a very material one. The Company's European regiments continued mere skeletons, because it was Mr. Dundas's plan to have King's regiments in India; and, therefore, the Company were not permitted to recruit in England beyond a certain extent. Another great expense was incurred, by the rank which it was necessary to give the Company's officers, to rank and put them on a footing with the officers in his Majesty's service. Formerly, when an officer with the rank of captain commanded a battalion of eight hundred Sepoys, it was of no consequence what he was called, whether captain or colonel; but when he acted constantly with his Majesty's forces, it became necessary that his rank should be equal to his command.—The establishment of the army in India, therefore, was under Mr. Dundas, treble as to expense in peace, to the peace establishment of 1778.——A great change also took place in the civil establishments. Under the Company, the pay of their civil servants was by no means equal to their necessary and unavoidable expenses; but their emoluments when they obtained official situations were considerable, though not avowed. It was Mr. Dundas's plan to make their salaries so large, that a moderate fortune, with economy, might be saved in twelve or fourteen years, and to cut off every possibility of secret emoluments.——I am not finding fault with the principle, but the *effect* was, an increase of half a million sterling a year in the civil disbursements of Bengal alone, and the system extended to Madras and Bombay also.——The simple question is this. Was there a necessity to make these important changes in the civil and military service of the Company? I think not. I think that every thing which has been done in India by the joint exertions of the King's and Company's forces, might have been effected by the Company's troops had the directors been permitted alone, to keep their European regiments complete. ——Lord Clive gained the battle of Plassey, in 1757, with 640 Europeans and 2,400 Sepoys, though opposed by the Nabob of Bengal, at the head of 80,000 men, and 100 pieces of cannon.——Major Adams, in 1763, drove Cossim Ally Cawn out of Bengal, though his army was still more numerous, and Major Adams had not 3,000 men in the field.——Sir Hector Munro, in 1764, gained the battle of Buscar, against the Vizier Sujah Dowlah, though the latter was strongly entrenched, had 20,000 troops, and a numerous artillery, well served. Sir Hector Munro's force was less than 7,000 men, and not a seventh of the number Europeans. —— Sir Eyre Coote defeated Hyder Ally in three several engagements, in 1781, when Hyder was flushed by his recent victories, though Sir Eyre had at no one time 7,000 men under his command.——Colonel Goddard marched across the continent of India, in 1778, at the head of six battalions of Sepoys, and a small body of Candahar horse, in despite of every opposition of the Mahrattas. He afterwards conquered the province of Guzzerat, and defeated the Mahrattas in various general actions. ——The question may be asked, whether the Mahrattas fight better now than they did formerly? I do not believe it. Their late success against Colonel Monson has been owing to other causes, not to the military skill of Holkar, nor to the bravery of his troops. As far as we know, the misfortune was occasioned by a want of provisions, by incessant rains, and a want of co operation. There has been no French force to assist the Mahrattas, except in the management of their artillery, and that force was destroyed by Lord Lake.——We have acquired by the destruction of Tippoo, in 1799, and by the late war with the Mahrattas, a vast accession of territory in India. We possess the whole sea coast, from Surat on the Malabar side, to the Bay of Bengal; so that it is impossible the French, at any period, should effect a landing in force, if they were mad enough to attempt it. We have this additional advantage, a revenue in India of ten millions sterling a year. Were the French to attack us in India, they must send with their fleet, and with their troops, money for their subsistence, if they could find provisions to purchase. I have no idea therefore, that the petty warfare with Holkar can endanger our empire in India. But, Mr Cobbett, I say with you, that if India does not much more than support itself in future, our acquisitions are a misfortune, and a *loss*. I agree that your quotations from Lord Melville's speeches are very correct. Many of them I heard him deliver, and I concurred in opinion with him, that India, instead of requiring assistance from us, would afford relief to Great Britain. Why it has not yet done so, is plain. The expenses which Mr Dundas found so enormous in 1784, and which it was his plan then to reduce, have been increased beyond all calculation. This is the

sole cause of our disappointment.——France has never been able since 1783, to give us the smallest disturbance in India, beyond the capture of a few trading vessels, and we have always had a superior fleet in the Indian Ocean.——Our debt has not been contracted by the wars with the country powers, in which we have been engaged since 1784, but by the extent of our civil and military establishments, (both of which were formed by Lord Melville) and by the expenses of the expedition to Egypt.——It may be said in opposition to my humble opinion, that our military establishments must remain as they now are, and that no reduction of the civil charges can take place. If so, I am most confident, that instead of a diminution of the India debt, it must increase as long as money can be borrowed in India.—— Lord Melville once observed in the House of Commons, that since he had looked into the Company's accounts, he was astonished to find how very inconsiderable the extra expenses, incurred by the wars in India had been, compared with the idea which he had formed of their amount. Though the observation, as applied to himself was correct, yet it does not follow that the extra expenses occasioned by war, in India, are trifling; on the contrary, they are very large, owing to the increased allowances to officers and men when on service, and to the increased expense of the ordnance department. But at the periods to which Lord Melville referred, the armies with which we *conquered*, and *preserved* India, were so small, that the largest force employed in any one body, would appear as *an advanced guard* to the armies we now maintain.——ASIATICUS.

SCOTCH PATRONAGE.

SIR,—Though a century has very near elapsed, since the union of England and Scotland, it is surprising to observe how little the people, or even the statesmen of the former country, know of, or interest themselves in the affairs peculiar to the latter. Various examples of this might be given; but at present I am only to state one. We have all, or at least many have heard of the *Civil Establishment of Scotland*, as distinct from the English establishment. We have heard of the *Scots Pension List*, which forms no inconsiderable part of that establishment; and though a few years ago a copy of it was laid before the House of Commons, yet no person on that, or any other occasion, thought of inquiring out of what fund that establishment and those pensions were paid! With your permission I will, through the medium of your Register, let the public a little into the secret, or rather put them on the scent, if it shall be thought worth prosecuting.——The *proper* revenue of the Scottish monarchs arose from the quit rents or duties paid out of lands; the tithes which came to the crown, by the reformation, and the abolition of episcopacy; and what are called *casualties*, that is, fines upon the change of property and other contingencies. The amount of these, though much diminished by the lavish grants made by James the 6th (the 1st of England), and his successors, was, at the union, still very considerable. These composed the privy purse, out of which the civil establishment, the salaries of the judges, &c. were paid. The remainder was considered to be at the disposal of the monarch, that is, of his minister; for I presume you are not to learn, that ever since the union, there has been a person, well known to the country, though not, perhaps, altogether so well known to the constitution, by the title of minister for Scotland. That office has been held for many years by Lord Melville, and the great duty of it is the *recommendation for places and pensions*, and particularly the distribution of the surplus of the revenue abovementioned, through the channel of the Treasury, the Barons of the Scots exchequer, and the Receiver of the King's *land rents* and *casualties*.——What now comes into the hands of the general receiver from that source, is reduced to a trifle: a new mode of giving pensions has been adopted, by making grants of the revenue arising in particular districts, or which ought to be paid out of particular estates. There is now before the House of Commons an instance of this in the grant to Lady Melville, of the rents of the lordship of Fife, by which about 900l. a year (not to mention 3,000l. of arrears) are put into her ladyship's pocket, taken from the fund especially appropriated for the civil establishment. It were easy, but it might be deemed invidious, to name many others pensioned in the same way. And there is another mode of lessening the revenue. The debtors of the crown, when the annual payment is considerable (and you will guess who these are) are suffered to run in arrear, and, from time to time, obtain discharges, or their *quietus*; but that is by the favour of the minister, and depends, you will easily believe, upon their *good behaviour*.——While the fund out of which the establishment and the *direct* pensions ought to be paid is thus abstracted, the list increases every day. There is no limitation upon the Scots minister, as there is upon the English,

who, by Mr. Burke's bill, is restrained from granting above 400*l.* a year, (I think) without the consent of parliament; witness the pension of 1,500*l.* lately granted to Lord Melville, in addition to his salary of 3,000*l.* a year for discharging the sinecure office of privy seal. It is said, that when Lord Melville resigned his English office about three years ago, he left with Mr. Addington a list of pensions he had promised to procure so numerous, and to such an amount, that that gentleman stood aghast at it, and, with a few exceptions, they were not granted during his administration. Whether the promises have been fulfilled *since Lord Melville and Mr Pitt came again into office* will appear, if any member of parliament thinks it worth while to call for the pension list, and the dates of the several warrants.——That the *land rents and casualties*, and other monies *actually* coming into the hands of the receiver general, who is the pay-master of the establishment, are not sufficient for that purpose, seems therefore highly probable. ——They are generally understood to be greatly deficient, and yet the establishment and pensions are paid with much more regularity in Scotland than in England. From whence does the money come? That is the question I wish to be put, where an answer can be compelled, and an evasion or false answer detected. —Till I see whether this attracts notice, I shall only add, that I believe if an investigation were made, a scene would be laid open sufficient to excite astonishment, even in these times, and after the appearance of the *Tenth Report*. ——SCOTO BRITANNICUS.

DOMESTIC OFFICIAL PAPERS.

CAPTURE OF DOMINICA.—*Copy of a Letter of General Prevost, commanding at Dominica, to the Master of the Sloop Endeavour, to be delivered to the Commander in Chief of His Majesty's Forces, or to the Governor or President of the first Land he should make. Dated 24th Feb.* 1805.

SIR,—You will inform the commander in chief of His Majesty's naval and land forces, that a force from France, consisting of one three-decker and two 74's, frigates, &c. with troops on board, invested the island on the 20th, and made good their landing on the following day (the 21st); they were most successfully resisted by the troops under my command, and repeatedly driven back.——The ships of the line in vain attempted to silence the batteries; but unfortunately the town being on fire, the militia on the right, notwithstanding their spirited conduct, were compelled to fall back.—— I deemed it prudent to allow the council to capitulate for the town of Roseau and its dependencies, whilst I attempted, by forced marches, to get into Prince Rupert, with such force as I could collect, in which I have succeeded, and wait their attack on this post, with a well grounded expectation that His Majesty's regulars and militia forces will again distinguish themselves. I retreated from Roseau on the 21st, at 4 P. M and understand the terms I prescribed are acceded to. I ordered none to be accepted that were not honourable, and desired the French commander not to allow his troops to disgrace themselves by plundering, or any act of wantonness. You are hereby desired to sail immediately, and make the first island you can. If privateers in the Guadaloupe Channel prevent your turning to windward, make Montserrat or Antigua.

CATHOLICS' PETITION.

On Monday, the 25th of March, the following Petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland was laid before the two Houses of Parliament.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE AND HONOURABLE THE KNIGHTS, CITIZENS, BURGESSES OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED,

The humble Petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, whose names are hereunto subscribed, on behalf of themselves and of others his Majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion,

SHEWETH,—That your petitioners are stedfastly attached to the person, family, and government of their Most Gracious Sovereign; that they are impressed with sentiments of affectionate gratitude for the benign laws which have been enacted for meliorating their condition during his paternal reign, and that they contemplate, with rational and decided predilection, the admirable principles of the British constitution.—Your petitioners most humbly state, that they have, solemnly and publicly, taken the oaths by law prescribed to his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, as tests of political and moral principles; and they confidently appeal to the sufferings which they have long endured, and the sacrifices which they still make, rather than violate their consciences (by taking oaths of a religious or spiritual import contrary to their belief) as decisive proofs of their profound and scrupulous reverence for the sacred obligations of an oath.——Your petitioners beg leave to

r[illegible]ent—that by those awful tests they bind themselves, in the presence of the all-seeing Deity, whom all classes of Christians adore, "to be faithful and bear true allegiance to their most gracious Sovereign "Lord King George the Third, and him to "defend to the utmost of their power against "all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever "that shall be made against his person, "crown or dignity; to do their utmost endeavours to disclose and make known to "his Majesty and his heirs all treasons and "traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them, and faithfully to "maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of their power, the succession to the "Crown in his Majesty's family against any "person or persons whatsoever."—"That, "by those oaths they renounce and abjure "obedience and allegiance unto any other "person claiming or pretending a right to "the crown of this realm:—that they reject "and detest, as unchristian and impious to "believe, that it is lawful in any ways to "injure any person or persons whatsoever "under pretence of their being heretics, and "also that unchristian and impious principle,—that no faith is to be kept with heretics; that it is no article of their faith, "and that they renounce, reject, and abjure "the opinion, that princes, excommunicated by the pope and council or by any "authority whatsoever, may be deposed, or "murdered by their subjects or by any person whatsoever; that they do not believe "that the Pope of Rome or any other foreign prince, prelate, state or potentate, "hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority or pre-eminence within this realm; that they "firmly believe, that no act, in itself unjust, "immoral or wicked, can ever be justified, "or excused by or under pretence or colour, "that it was done for the good of the church "or in obedience to any ecclesiastical power "whatsoever, and that it is not an article of "the Catholic faith, neither are they thereby required to believe or profess, that the "pope is infallible, or that they are bound "to any order, in its own nature immoral, "though the pope or any ecclesiastical power should issue or direct such order; but "that on the contrary they hold, that it "would be sinful in them to pay any respect or obedience thereto; that they do "not believe, that any sin whatsoever, committed by them, can be forgiven at the "mere will of any pope or of any priest, or "of any person or persons whatsoever, but "that any person, who receives absolution "without a sincere sorrow for such sin and "a firm and sincere resolution to avoid future guilt, and to atone to God, so far "from obtaining thereby any remission of "his sin, incurs the additional guilt of violating a sacrament; and" by the same solemn obligation "they are bound and firmly pledged to defend, to the utmost of "their power, the settlement and arrangement of property in their country, as established by the laws now in being; that "they have disclaimed, disavowed, and solemnly abjured any intention to subvert "the present church establishment for "the purpose of substituting a Catholic "establishment in its stead;" and that they have also solemnly sworn, "that they will "not exercise any privilege, to which they "are or may become entitled, to disturb or "weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in Ireland."——Your petitioners most humbly beg leave to shew, that however painful it is to their feelings, that it should still be thought necessary to exact such tests from them, (and from them alone of all his Majesty's subjects), they can with perfect truth affirm, that the political and moral principles, which are thereby asserted, are not only conformable to their opinions, but expressly inculcated by the religion which they profess; and your petitioners most humbly trust, that the religious doctrines, which permit such tests to be taken, will be pronounced by this honourable House to be entitled to a toleration, not merely partial but complete, under the happy constitution and government of this realm; and that his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, holding those principles, will be considered as subjects, upon whose fidelity the state may repose the firmest reliance.—Your petitioners further most humbly shew, that 26 years have now elapsed since their most gracious Sovereign and the honourable Houses of Parliament in Ireland, by their public and deliberate act, declared, that, "from the uniform peaceable behaviour of the Roman Catholics of Ireland for a long series of years, it appeared reasonable and expedient to relax the disabilities and incapacities under which they laboured, and that it must tend not only to the cultivation and improvement of this kingdom, but to the prosperity and strength of all his Majesty's dominions, that his Majesty's subjects of all denominations should enjoy the blessings of a free constitution, and should be bound to each other by mutual interest and mutual affection," a declaration, founded upon unerring principles of justice and sound policy, which still remains to be carried into full effect (although your petitioners are impressed

with a belief, that the apprehensions, which retarded its beneficial operation previous to the union, cannot exist in the Parliament of the United Kingdom)——For your petitioners most humbly shew, that, by virtue of divers statutes now in force, his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, who form so great a proportion of the population of Ireland, and contribute so largely to the resources of the state, do yet labour under many incapacities, restraints, and privations, which affect them with peculiar severity in almost every station of life; that more especially they are denied the capacity of sitting or voting in either of the honourable Houses of Parliament; the manifold evils consequent upon which incapacity they trust it is unnecessary to unfold and enumerate to this hon. House. They are disabled from holding or exercising (unless by a special dispensation) any corporate office whatsoever in the cities or towns in which they reside; they are incapacitated and disqualified from holding or exercising the offices of sheriffs and subsheriffs, and various offices of trust, honour, and emolument in the state, in His Majesty's military and naval service, and in the administration of the laws, in this their native land. —— Your petitioners, declining to enter into the painful detail of the many incapacities and inconveniencies avowedly inflicted by those statutes, upon His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, beg leave, however, most earnestly to solicit the attention of this Hon. House, to the humiliating and ignominious system of exclusion, reproach, and suspicion, which those statues generate and keep alive. —— For your petitioners most humbly shew, that in consequence of the hostile spirit thereby sanctioned, their hopes of enjoying even the privileges, which through the benignity of their most gracious Sovereign, they have been capacitated to enjoy, are nearly altogether frustrated, inasmuch that they are, in effect, shut out from almost all the honours, dignities, and offices of trust and emolument in the state, from rank and distinction in His Majesty's army and navy, and even from the lowest situations and franchises in the several cities and corporate towns throughout His Majesty's dominions.——And your petitioners severely feel, that this unqualified interdiction of those of their communion from all municipal stations, from the franchises of all guilds and corporations, and from the patronage and benefits annexed to those situations, is an evil not terminating in itself; for they beg leave to state, that, by giving an advantage over those of their communion to others, by whom such situations are exclusively possessed, it establishes a species of qualified monopoly, universally operating in their disfavour, contrary to the spirit, and highly detrimental to the freedom of trade.—— Your petitioners likewise severely feel, that His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, in consequence of their exclusion from the offices of sheriffs and sub sheriffs, and of the hostile spirit of those statutes, do not fully enjoy certain other inestimable privileges of the British Constitution, which the law has most jealously maintained and secured to their fellow subjects.—Your petitioners most humbly beg leave to solicit the attention of this Honourable House to the distinction which has conceded the elective, and denies the representative franchise to one and the same class of His Majesty's subjects; which detaches from property its proportion of political power under a Constitution, whose vital principle is the union of the one with the other; which closes every avenue of legalized ambition against those who must be presumed to have great credit and influence among the mass of the population of the country; which refuses to peers of the realm all share in the legislative representation, either actual or virtual, and renders the liberal profession of the law to Roman Catholics a mere object of pecuniary traffic, despoiled of its hope, and of its honours.——Your petitioners further most humbly shew, that the exclusion of so numerous and efficient a portion of His Majesty's subjects as the Roman Catholics of this realm, from civil honours and offices and from advancement in His Majesty's army and navy, actually impairs, in a very material degree, the most valuable resources of the British Empire, by impeding His Majesty's general service, stifling the most honourable and powerful incentives to civil and military merit, and unnecessarily restricting the exercise of that bright prerogative of the Crown, which encourages good subjects to promote the public welfare, and excites them to meritorious actions, by a well regulated distribution of public honours and rewards.——Your petitioners beg leave most humbly to submit, that those manifold incapacities, restraints and privations, are absolutely repugnant to the liberal and comprehensive principles recognized by their most gracious Sovereign and the Parliament of Ireland: that they are impolitic restraints upon His Majesty's prerogative; that they are hurtful and vexatious to the feelings of a loyal and generous people, and that the total abolition of them will be found not only compatible with, but highly conducive to, the perfect security of every establish-

ment, religious or political, now existing in this realm ——For your petitioners most explicitly declare, that they do not seek or wish, in the remotest degree, to injure or encroach upon "the rights, privileges, "immunities, possessions, or revenues, ap- "pertaining to the bishops and clergy of "the Protestant Religion as by law estab- "lished, or to the churches committed to "their charge, or to any of them."—The sole object of your petitioners being an equal participation, upon equal terms with their fellow subjects of the full benefits of the British Laws and Constitution.——Your petitioners beg leave most humbly to observe, that, although they might well and justly insist upon the firm and unabated loyalty of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects to their most gracious Sovereign, their profound respect for the legislature, and their dutiful submission to the laws, yet they most especially rest their humble claims and expectations of relief upon the clear and manifest conduciveness of the measure, which they solicit, to the general and permanent tranquillity, strength, and happines of the British Empire. And your petitioners, entertaining no doubt of its final accomplishment, from its evident justice and utility, do most solemnly assure this Honourable House, that their earnest solicitude for it, at this peculiar crisis, arises principally from their anxious desire to extinguish all motives to disunion, and all means of exciting discontent.—— For your petitioners humbly state it as their decided opinion, that the enemies of the British Empire, who meditate the subjugation of Ireland, have no hope of success, save in the disunion of its inhabitants; and therefore it is, that your petitioners are deeply anxious, at this moment, that a measure should be accomplished, which will annihilate the principle of religious animosity, and animate all descriptions of His Majesty's subjects in an enthusiastic defence of the best Constitution, that has ever yet been established.——Your petitioners therefore most humbly presume to express their earnest, but respectful hope, that this Honourable House will, in its wisdom and liberality, deem the several statutes, now in force against them, no longer necessary to be retained, and that His Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, professing the Roman Catholic religion, may be effectually relieved from the operation of those statutes, and that so they may be restored to the full enjoyment of the benefits of the British Constitution, and to every inducement of attachment to that Constitution, equally and in common with their fellow subjects throughout the British Empire.——And your petitioners will ever pray, &c. Shrewsbury, Waterford, and Wexford. Fingall, Kenmare, Gormanstown, Southwell, Trimlestown, Robert Plunket, Thomas Barnewall, Thomas French, Bt. Edward Bellew, Bt. Francis Goold, Bt. Thomas Ryan, James Ryan, Edward Moore, John Purcell, M. D. Thomas Egan, M. D. Ambrose O'Farrel, Richard Bolger, Randal MacDonnel, Christopher D. Bellew, Anthony Donelan, John Harney, Gerard Wm. Bagot, O'Donoghue of the Glins, Hugh O'Connor, Pierce O'Brien Butler, John O'Reilly, Thomas O'Connor, John Rorke, James Nowlan, jun. Nicholas Fleming, Denis Thomas O'Brien, James Scully, Denys Scully, James Nangle, Antony O'Donel, M. D. Thomas Warren, John Dully, Richard Sause, Bartholomew Taylor, Joseph Taylor, Charles Ryan, Francis Cruise, Nicholas Gannon, Valentine O'Connor, Walter Dowdall, Francis Coleman, Lewis Ward, James P. Ward, Valentine O'Connor, jun. Thomas Fitzgerald, David Hinchy, James Barron, Edward Ryan, John Burke, Edward Burke, James Byrne, John Brennan, Jeremiah Ryan, Pierse Barron, Wm. Barron, Charles Byrne, Dominick Rice, Ambrose Moore, Rundle P. MacDonnell, Eneas MacDonnell, John Byrne, Robert Caddel, Daniel O'Connell, Thomas Barry, John Lalor, M. F. Lynch, Thomas Dillon, Christopher Taylor, Philip Roche, Charles Roche, Elias Corbally, John Taaffe, Thomas Fitzgerald, Richard Strange, Dont. Willm. O'Reilly, George Goold, Malachy Donelan, William Bellew, Robert French, Maurice O'Connell, Daniel Cronin, Daniel O'Mahony, James Ryan, Gerald Aylmer, Thomas Galway, John Whyte, John Roche, Thomas Redington, E. Burke, J. M. Grainger, H. Trant, R. S. Keating.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

NAVAL INQUIRY.——In the preceding number of this work was inserted the Tenth Report of the Commissioners of Naval Inquiry, together with the most material part of the evidence thereunto annexed, and also the written defence of Mr. Trotter. To those documents and to the observations made thereon, I beg leave to refer the reader; because what I have now to offer must be considered merely as supplementary to what has already been said.——It is known, that, as soon as the Tenth Report came before parliament in its printed state, Mr. Whitbread gave notice of his intention to make a motion relative thereto on Thurs-

day, the 4th instant. Of course, the discussion would have taken place on that day; but, on Monday last, the 1st instant, it was requested, by Mr. Pitt, that the motion should be postponed until Monday, the 8th instant, upon the following ground: that Lord Melville had, on Thursday the 28th ultimo, addressed a letter to the Commissioners of Naval Inquiry, relative to the Tenth Report, and that the said letter, together with any proceedings thereon on the part of the Commissioners, ought to be printed and laid before the House previous to the intended discussion.——After some hesitation on the part of Mr. Grey, who spoke for Mr. Whitbread in his absence, it was agreed to postpone the motion of the latter till Monday next.—Relating to this occurrence, the first object of remark would be, the singular fitness of things as exhibited in the time, the place, and *the person*, when, where, and by whom, this proposition was made: but, of that person hereafter: the time is now come when the people will have abundant opportunities of comparing his past professions with his present conduct. ——It is said, that the letter of Lord Melville, represented by Mr. Pitt as "containing points of explanation of the highest "importance," states, that his lordship is *now* ready to *swear*, that he derived no advantage whatever from the use of the public money flowing through his office. The reader will recollect, that he refused to swear this, when under examination; and, that he sheltered himself under the 5th clause of the act, under which the Naval Commissioners were sitting. What can have induced him to change his mind? Or, *where* can he have obtained new lights upon the subject? *Every paper*, relating to his concerns with the treasurership of the navy, he *burnt*, at his leisure hours, during his retirement in Scotland, as appears from his letter to the Commissioners (See Reg. p. 455.) From his own papers, therefore, he can have obtained no information on which he did not possess when he wrote the aforementioned letter on the 30th of June last, previous to his examination upon oath. But, we are told by one of his partisans, that, he hesitated to answer before, because, Mr. Trotter, having so confounded the public account with his own and his own with that of Lord Melville, had rendered it impossible for his lordship to know, whether he might, or might not, have derived some advantage from Mr. Trotter's having misemployed the public money! What! and, is it likely that Mr. Trotter should, *against the will* of Lord Melville, keep his accounts for so many years in this strange way? Is it likely that he should have done so without his lordship's knowledge? Did his lordship draw on him, or receive money from him, and not know how much, and *whose*, money it was that he was receiving? Trotter has said, upon his oath, that such was the nature of their monied connexion, that he could not pretend to point out the cases when he advanced money to Mr. Dundas out of his private funds, or out of the funds belonging to the public. Whether such a mode of keeping accounts be much in use; whether it arose, in this instance, from a desire to afford, when called on, an elucidation of the transactions of the treasurer and his paymaster; or whether, indeed, it might have in view (though that is hardly credible) the possibility of something like that which has now happened, and, therefore, provided the means of baffling the researches of impertinent curiosity: these are questions which may properly enough come under discussion another time; but, at present, all we have to ask is: *how*, if the accounts were kept in the manner described by Mr. Trotter and his principal, has that principal been able to discover, to a certainty, that he did not derive any advantage from Mr. Trotter's malpractices; that he did not, in short, go snacks with Mr. Trotter? Yet, the question goes further: how has that principal been able to make the discovery *now*, at this late, this very late hour? Does any one imagine, that Lord Melville did not know the contents of the Tenth Report before that Report came out in the newspapers? It has been upon the table of the House of Commons these two months. How came his lordship not to think of the "points of explanation of "great importance," as his right hon. friend calls them; how came he never to think of submitting these points to the commissioners, and to offer (as it is said he has done) to swear to them till *now*? Now! when the report is printed, and has been read and talked of by the whole nation, and when his *refusal to swear* has been so universally insisted on as a proof of his having participated? Really, it is a pity the offer to swear (if it be at last made) was not made sooner!——But, we have not yet driven the nail home. *Where*; in the name of probability and of common sense, I ask, *where* has his lordship now found the happy means of ascertaining with such precision, that he has never received a share of Mr. Trotter's profits? *All* his own papers, relative to the matter, he had *burnt* previous to the month of June last. As to Mr. Trotter's accounts nothing can have been gathered from them to

enlighten his conscience, because that intelligent person himself swore, that he was unable to state, whether Mr. Dundas had derived any profit from the use of the public money, or not. There remains, then, no source but that of Mr. Dundas's own recollection; and, upon an inquiry into *dates*, we shall find little ground for believing, that recollection can have afforded him much assistance. From the language of his partisans, one would conclude, that he had, in the first instance, been taken by *surprise*; and, that, knowing Mr. Trotter to have advanced him great sums of money, he could not positively swear, that none of that money ever came out of the public purse, and, of course, that he could not swear that he had not derived any advantage from the misuse of the public money passing through his office. But, first, observe, that there was *no surprise*. The Commissioners, with a degree of candour equal to their diligence, intelligence, and integrity, permitted the persons, whom they examined, to come afterwards and *explain* or *correct* the answers they had given; accordingly we see, that Mr. Trotter, Mr. Antrobus, and others, *did* make such explanations and corrections. Why did not Lord Melville do the same? Then, let it be remembered, that it is now two months since the report was laid before parliament; and that it is *four months* since his lordship's evidence was taken by the Commissioners. Strange, that he should never think of his explanations till *now!* Till now, that the people are demanding justice! But, four months for consideration; four months for explanation is not all; for, it must be observed, that his lordship had a very long time, in the first instance, to prepare those answers, which he now has thought it necessary to explain. Mr. Trotter was examined *before*, and not only before, but several months before, Lord Melville was examined. Mr. Trotter's examination began in *June* last, and Lord Melville's took place in November. All the questions which could be put to the latter had been put to the former first. One of them was in London and the other at Wimbledon; and, I leave any one to guess whether Mr. Trotter gave his lordship an account of what had, in respect to him, passed at the Board of Commissioners! On the *14th of June* (See Register, p. 488) Mr. Trotter was asked by the Commissioners, whether Mr. Dundas had derived any advantage from the misuse of the public money; and, it was not till the *5th of November* that the same question was put to Lord Melville (formerly Mr. Dundas) himself. Was not here plenty of time for him to consider of the answer he should give? Was this taking him by surprise? And now, after having had five months to prepare his answer, and four months more to see how that answer would be received, he comes with his "points of explanation!" Verily, he who has a good cause stands not in need of such indulgence.——There are two or three detached arguments that I have heard made use of, in behalf of Lord Melville and Mr. Trotter, which I will just notice. The first is, that "Lord Melville is as *poor* as a church mouse." I could, in the words of his own countryman, *quorry the fact*; for, I think, it will be allowed, that eleven thousand a year from the public purse, between him and his lady, leaves them little reason to complain of poverty; especially when we see, that about eight thousand a year is settled on them for life. We have not the *rent roll* of Lord Melville; if we had, we should probably discover that he is far from being poor, even as to landed estates. Besides; what does a man want with money, but to make him great, and to make his family great; and, has not he effected this? Is he not the first Lord of the Admiralty of Great Britain? Is he not in the post formerly filled by *Lord Howe*, *Lord Spencer*, and Lord *St. Vincent?* Could his most daring hopes ever have aspired to such an honour? Is he not, besides, the sovereign dispenser of power and wealth in India and in Scotland? Let any one refer to an article, in a former part of this sheet, upon the subject of Scotch patronage; and, let him recollect, at the same time, that Lord Melville has, for many years, had the disposing of India patronage to an amount that produces a hundred thousand a year; let this be recollected, and let the reader consider what effects this power has had upon his own family. Mr. Dundas was, at one and the same time, Treasurer of the Navy, President of the Board of Control, and Secretary of State for the War department. What a sweep of power! What millions of patronage! He is now at the *head* of the Admiralty; his nephew is Secretary at War. These were two departments hitherto not absolutely glutted with the Dundas's and their followers. They were fresh fields, as it were; and a glorious harvest they are yielding! Let it be observed, too, that Mr. Trotter, that ingenious accountant, is now again *Paymaster of the Navy*. This fact should be kept in view. The tenth report has not been able to remove him. Mr. Canning, too, has, I believe, the good fortune to be related to Lord Melville. Oh! it is a thrifty and a thriving race! I see no signs of that *poverty*, of which the partisans of his

lordship think it wise to talk. Yes; to *talk* of this poverty is a very good thing. Used in this way, it is a most useful quality. The being constantly dunned, and now and then *sued* for a trifling sum, are excellent proofs of a minister's *purity* and *disinterestedness!* This trick is, however, almost worn out. Every thing has its day; and, I am persuaded, that the years are drawing nigh, when, to acquit a minister charged with peculation, something more than pretensions to poverty will be required. Men will recollect the parable of the unjust steward, and will look not merely at the wealth amassed by a minister himself, but at that which has been amassed, in so short a space of time and so unaccountably, by his relations and close political adherents; and, they will clearly discover, that, while he suffers all around him to plunder, it would be perfect folly in him to become a plunderer in his own name.——With respect to Mr. Trotter, the plea of *poverty* has not been urged; but, we are told, by Lord Melville himself, of the *inadequacy* of his salary. Viewing Mr. Trotter, seated in his splendid mansion, with a fortune of a million, or more, we naturally look upon his salary of 500l. a year, now augmented to 800l. a year, as a mere trifle; especially, when we see him annually charged in Mr. Coutt's books with from 200l. to 300l. for *Christmas boxes!* But, strip Mr. Trotter of these appendages; make an estimate of his intrinsic talents and merits; and you will find, that his salary, together with a dwelling house, perhaps, with coals and candles, were quite as much as it was proper to allow him. And, as to the "responsibility," of which so much has been said, the Commissioners have very justly observed, that *if the law had been obeyed*, there would have been no responsibility resting upon him. The plain statement of the case, then, is; that, by risking the public money, and by augmenting the public expenses, he first amasses immense sums, and then he claims those sums as a just compensation for his *responsibility*; which is, I take it, in no respect interior to the conduct, spoken of by Swift, of Lord Peterborough's steward, who pulled down a house, sold the materials, pocketed the money, and then charged his lordship with *repairs!* . . . . .

Since the foregoing part of this article was written, the LETTER OF LORD MELVILLE to the Commissioners has made its appearance in the SUN newspaper. It has no date; but it must be taken for granted, that it was, agreeably to the statement of Mr. Pitt, written on the 28th ultimo. All that I have hitherto said respecting it is fully applicable to its contents; only, that I proceeded upon the supposition, that his lordship had now offered to swear positively, that he never did derive any *profit or advantage* from the use which was made of the public money, passing through his office. This is not the case; and, indeed, except as the means of procuring a short delay, it is very hard to conceive what purpose this letter could be expected or intended to answer. Such as it is, however, I shall here insert it, and then trouble the reader with a very short observation or two upon its contents.— "Having read your "Tenth Report, and observing particularly "the following paragraph in the 141st "page. "However the apprehension of "" disclosing delicate and confidential "" transactions of government might ope-"" rate with Lord Melville in with-holding "" information respecting advances to other "" departments, we do not perceive how "" that apprehension can at all account for "" his refusing to state whether he derived "" any profit or advantage from the use "" or employment of money issued for the "" services of the navy. If his lordship "" had received into his hands such mo-"" nies as were advanced by him to other "" departments, and had replaced them "" as soon as they were repaid, he could "" not have derived any profit or ad-"" vantage from such transactions, how-"" ever repugnant they might be to "" the provisions of the legislature for the "" safe custody of public money."——I "think it necessary to state the following "observations, in order to place in their "just view the grounds on which I declined "answering your question, and which you "appear not to have accurately understood. "——When you first called upon me for "information, I stated to you that I had not "materials on which I could frame such an "account as you required me at that time "to prepare, and in a communication with "Mr Trotter, before my examination on "the 5th of November last, I learnt, *for the "first time*, that in the accounts he had "kept respecting my private concerns, he "had so blended his own private monies "with what he had in his hands of public "money, that it was impossible for him to "ascertain, with precision, whether the ad-"vances he had occasion to make to me "in the course of his running private ac-"count with me, were made from the one "or from the other aggregate sums which "constituted his balance with Messrs.

" Coutts. This circumstance, which I understood Mr. Trotter had distinctly communicated to you, made it impossible for " me to return any other answer than I did " to the general question which you put to " me—" Whether Mr. Trotter had applied " " any of the money issued for carrying " " on the current service of the navy for " " my benefit or advantage?" and to this " circumstance I uniformly referred in my " answers to other questions respecting the " manner in which Mr. Trotter applied the " money in his hands.—— When you put " the question to me, " Whether I did di- " " rect or authorize Mr. Trotter to lay out " " or apply, or cause to be laid out or ap- " " plied, any of the money issued for car- " " rying on the current service of the navy, " " to my benefit or advantage?" My " answer was, " To the best of my recol- " " lection I never did."——That answer " I now repeat. Had you proceeded to " inquire whether I ever had *any understanding*, expressed or implied, with Mr. " Trotter respecting any participation of " advantages derived from the custody of " the public money, or whether I at any " time *knowingly* derived any advantage to " myself from any advances of public money, I should have had no hesitation in " declaring, as I now declare, that there " never was any such *understanding*, nor *any thing like it*, between Mr. Trotter and " myself: that I never *knowingly* derived " any such advantages; and that whatever " emolument accrued to Mr. Trotter in the " conduct of the pecuniary concerns of the " office, was, so far as I am informed, exclusively his own.——With respect to " any advances which Mr. Trotter might " make on my private account, I considered " myself as debtor to him alone, and as " standing with regard to him, in no other " predicament than I should have done " with any other man of business, who " might be in occasional advance to me in " the general management of my concerns " entrusted to him. It is impossible for " me to ascertain from any documents or " vouchers in my hands, or now existing, " what the extent of those advances might " have been at any particular period. The " accounts which you have inserted in your " Report I never saw till I saw them in the " Report itself. *They are no accounts of " mine, nor am I a party to them.* They " contain a variety of sums issued nominally to me, which never came into my " hands, and they give no credit for various " sums received by Mr. Trotter on my private account from my salary as Treasurer " of the Navy, and other sources of income, " of which he was in the receipt, nor do " they take any notice of the security of " which he was in possession for the repayment of any balance at any time due " to him from private funds.——With respect to the sums of naval money advanced " to me, and applied to other services, I do " not feel it necessary to make any additional observations, except to declare, " that all those sums were returned to the " funds from which they were taken, having " in no instance been withdrawn from it " for any purpose of private emolument or " advantage.—— Before I conclude, I wish " to correct an inaccuracy which I observe " in one part of the evidence in Appendix " No. 7, p. 192. The question is put to " me, " Did you derive any profit or ad- " " vantage from the use or employment of " " money issued for carrying on the cur- " " rent service of the navy between the " " 19th Aug. 1782, and 30th April, 1783; " " or between the 1st Feb. 1784, and 31st " " Dec. 1785, during which periods you " " held the office of treasurer of the navy?" " which question I there answer by a reference to the answer given to a similar " question put to me before. This answer " is inaccurate in so far as it contains a reference to Mr. T.'s mode of blending his " funds in his private account with Messrs. " Coutts. Mr. Trotter was not paymaster " till the year 1786. The circumstances, " therefore, relating to Mr. Trotter's account, which precluded my returning an " answer to your former questions, do not " apply to the periods specified in that mentioned, and I can therefore have no difficulty in declaring, that during those periods I did not derive any advantage from " the use or employment of public money " issued for carrying on the service of the " navy. Having stated these facts, it is almost unnecessary to add, that I am at " any time ready to verify them upon my " oath.——I have the honour to be, Gentlemen,—MELVILLE."—— FIRST; is it not strange, that Mr. Dundas should never, till called upon by the Commissioners, have known in what manner his accounts were kept by Mr. Trotter? SECONDLY, is it not equally strange, that Mr. Dundas should possess no book, or paper, that could enable him to ascertain *what the extent* of Mr. Trotter's advances to him, at any one time, might be? One can easily enough conceive that Lord Melville is perfectly right in disclaiming all acquaintance with the accounts extracted from the books of Mr. Coutts; but, one must suppose the connexion be-

tween him and Mr. Trotter to be *of a very singular nature*, before one can possibly account for his having no document whatever to enable him to ascertain *what sums Mr. Trotter advanced him!*—THIRDLY (and, this, is, indeed, the jet of the letter) how is the case mended, by the introduction of the words, "*understanding*" and "KNOWINGLY?" Being asked, upon oath, whether Mr. Trotter had ever applied any of the Naval Money for his (Lord Melvilles') benefit or advantage, *he refused to answer*, for fear of *criminating* himself; but *now* he says, that, if the Commissioners had gone on and asked him, whether he, at any time, *knowingly* derived any such advantage, he should have had no hesitation in declaring, as he now declares, that he never knowingly did. And, why, if they did not put the question in this precise form, did he not answer in this form. Why did he not say: "*Knowingly* I never did?" They asked him whether he ever *directed* Trotter to lay out the public money for his advantage; to which he answered: "*To the best of my* "*recollection*, I never did." Why not give a qualified answer in the other case also? Why this *after-thought* in one case and not in the other? Why seek refuge under the act as to the deriving of advantage, and not seek that refuge as to the giving of Trotter positive directions to procure for him such advantage? Upon the term "*understanding*" a remark presents itself. When asked upon oath, whether he ever *directed* or *authorised* Trotter to lay out any of the Naval Money *for his* (Lord Melville's) *benefit or advantage*, his lordship answered: "To the best "of *my recollection* I never did." So, you see, after having had from June to November to think about it (except the little time that was taken up with the Catamaran project) he could *not* positively swear, that he *never had directed* Trotter to lay out the public money to his benefit or advantage! This he now explains by saying, that, if they had asked him, whether he ever had any "*un*-"*derstanding* with Mr. Trotter respecting "any *participation* of advantages," he should instantly have answered, that he never had any such understanding with Trotter. But, under correction of Lord Melville, this is quite another question; for, who does not perceive, that he might have directed Trotter to lay out the public money for his advantage, without letting Trotter participate with him? When a person of high rank and station is asked, 'did you ever direct any one to misapply the public money for your advantage,' we expect him to answer, 'NO:' we naturally expect, that he should need no *recollection* upon such a subject: in such a case, "he who deliberates is lost." This Lord Melville *now* appears to have discovered: the impression upon the public mind has been perceived; but, it is not to be removed by an explanation like that upon which we have been remarking. The same may be said of the answer to that plain and pithy question: did *you ever derive any benefit or advantage* from the misapplication of the naval money? To this question, if all had been right, what need was there of any answer but that which is contained in the afore-mentioned monosyllable? 'NO,' was all that ought to have been necessary, unless the impatience of the answerer had hurried into a repetition of that negative. 'No, NO, NO!" might have been expected; but, certainly no one ought, in such a case, and from such a person, to have expected hesitation, much less a *refusal*, grounded on a fear of self-crimination, and an exposure to pains or penalties. What, as to this question, was it to Lord Melville how Mr. Trotter's accounts were kept? Lord Melville OUGHT TO HAVE KNOWN that he *never pocketed any money but his own*; and, this was all that was wanted to enable him at once to answer the question of the Commissioners. There needed, in such case, no *qualification*; no recourse to the saving word "*knowingly*;" and, what must have been the connexion between these two men, if Mr. Dundas *did not know*, at any one time, whether he was pocketing the public money, or not? Is it meant to be insinuated, that Trotter was *in the habit of lending* him large sums of money, and that, as these loans were *advantageous* to him, he might, *unknowingly* receive advantage from the misapplication of the public money? But, first, how came Mr. Dundas to think of *borrowing* large sums of money from a clerk whose salary was only 800*l.* a year? This is, indeed, a most miserable subterfuge; for, what is it to the public whether he received the advantage in the shape of simple participation with Trotter, or whether Trotter conveyed it to him under the name of loans? ——This poor "*knowingly*" is an after-thought; but, it only makes the matter worse, for it now shows us, that even four months of reflection, aided by the animadversions of the public, have not enabled the accused to invent any thing that makes in his favour.——It has been asked, by the partisans of Lord Melville, how we can account for his refusing to swear at once (though falsely, suppose.) that he never derived any profit or advantage from the

misapplication of the public money; they have asked us, how we can possibly attribute this refusal to any thing but his lordship's *conscientiousness*; and, say they if you allow him to be so *conscientious*, how can you believe him guilty of peculation? This, if we were to admit the premises, is by no means a legitimate conclusion. But, we never have made such an admission. We never pretended to look for any motive in his lordship's refusal other than that which he professed to act from, namely, the fear of criminating himself and exposing himself to pains or penalties; and this he might do in two ways, first, by acknowledging himself guilty of peculation, and, secondly, by *swearing falsely*, and thereby incurring the *punishment due to wilful perjury*. This latter consideration was, one would think, quite sufficient to account for his refusal to swear that he never had derived any advantage from the misuse of the public money. Besides, if his lordship did touch a part of Mr. Trotter's little profits (and he is not even *yet* prepared to swear that he *did not*), can it be supposed, that Mr. Trotter would have been very well pleased at being *left alone*? Can it be supposed that Mr. Trotter would have *stomached that*? No; Mr. Trotter would certainly have thought himself ill-used, if the shield of the mighty northern chieftain had thus been withdrawn from him. In such case, God knows what Mr. Trotter might have been tempted to do, or at least, to *say!* Mr. Trotter would have had no notion of becoming the 'scape-goat; and no one could have blamed him. We see, indeed, that he has been treated with *great indulgence*. Some of the Dundas partisans, who have more zeal than knowledge, have attempted to throw *all* the burden upon Trotter. But, Lord Melville takes care not to countenance any such endeavour. He knows better. And, let it be remembered, that, notwithstanding all that has been discovered, Mr. Trotter is *still paymaster*; re-instated by Mr. Canning after he had been turned out by Mr. Tierney! There he is; still in that same office; still nosing and insulting that public, millions of whose earnings he has so freely handled!—— One advantage, afforded by Lord Melville's letter, is, that his partisans have no longer any justificatory matter to *bint at*. The whole of this matter is now before the parliament and the public. Indeed, the thing was complete before; and, it is impossible to attribute this letter to any other motive than that of obtaining a *delay*. This object the Commissioners appear clearly to have perceived; and, they have accordingly defeated it by answering, very truly, that it would not become them to re-open the examination upon the subject of the Tenth Report *merely upon the suggestion of any of the parties to whose conduct the Report relates*. They were, they say, occupied several months in the inquiry; those who were examined by them had the fullest opportunities of correcting, at any time, during the progress of the inquiry, any mistakes which might inadvertantly have been made. * But, is it, I would ask, reasonable to

* Answer of the Commissioners, dated 2d April, 1805 ——My lord,—We have received your lordship's letter of the 28th of last month, by which you intimate that we appear not to have accurately understood the grounds on which you declined answering our questions, and submit to us some observations in order to place those grounds in their just view; and also express a wish, before you conclude, to correct an inaccuracy in one part of your evidence, and a readiness to verify by your oath the facts stated in that letter.——If it be the object of this communication that we should again require your lordship's attendance, for the purpose of being examined, touching these matters, and that we should make a Supplemental Report upon the result of that examination, and such other examinations as we might ther-upon judge necessary, there can be no disinclination on our parts (as far as we are concerned in the proceeding) to meeting your lordship's wishes:—but it appears to us that the inquiry, which is the subject of the Tenth Report, has attained that period, when it would not become us to adopt such a measure, merely upon the suggestion of any of the parties, to whose conduct that Report relates.——We were occupied several months in investigating the mode of conducting the business of the office of Treasurer of the Navy: those who were examined by us had the fullest opportunity of stating and explaining all things which related to the management of that department, or to the share which they respectively had in it; and of correcting, at any time, during the progress of the inquiry, any mistakes which might inadvertently have been made. Our opinion and observations upon the irregularities and abuses, which we discovered, were formed and drawn up with the utmost care and deliberation; and they are now submitted to the three branches of the legislature, as the act, by which we are appointed, requires. If it could be made to appear upon a represen-

suppose, that these Commissioners are to be called back again to ask a man such questions as *he shall wish to have put to himself!* And, observe, too, that this takes place, after the report has been *printed*; after the comments of the people *have been heard*: after it has been ascertained *what parts of the examination have produced the greatest effect*, and stand, therefore, the most in need of *explanation!* Is it reasonable, or rather, is it not grossly absurd, to suppose, that such was the use, to which this Commission was to be applied? — I cannot conclude without repeating, that very great, and, in my opinion, much too great *indulgence*, has been granted to Mr. Trotter and his principal. Mr. Trotter was permitted to subjoin a written paper to the evidence which he had given, and to the questions which he had refused to answer upon oath. The Commissioners have pointed out the extreme modesty of the person, who, to avoid the danger of criminating himself refused explanations required of him, and afterwards offered a justification on his own terms; and, their remarks upon this topic would apply equally well to their present noble correspondent. It is, besides, an indulgence unheard of. When evidence is given, it cannot be recalled. A man cannot, either by explanation or otherwise, be permitted to unswear that which he has sworn. To permit a defence to be made in this way is, moreover, entirely without a precedent; and, the reader will remember, that I last week referred to the case of Sir Thomas Rumbold, who asked to have his justificatory papers presented to parliament in company with the report of the Committee that had examined evidence relative to his conduct, and whose request was positively refused, and that, too, by the very person, in whose behalf Mr. Pitt is now demanding a similar step as a right. Sir Thomas Rumbold was himself a member of parliament, and, when the resolutions of the Committee were brought forward for the sanction of the House, he moved, "that the papers laid upon the table by him, and necessary for his defence, be referred to the same committee." To this his accuser Mr. Dundas, objected: "Because," said he, "it would be perfectly inconsistent to *mix the defence with the accusation*; and, in fact, the Baronet cannot make a defence till he be charged, for the resolutions at present are to be sure strong facts against him, but nothing is yet decided on; and, agreeably to the parliamentary form, the *proper time for his defence* will be on the *second reading of the intended bill of pains and penalties against him*, when he will be allowed the free use of counsel, and every kind of evidence he may think proper to adduce." This was the doctrine of the very man, in whose behalf Mr. Pitt has now insisted upon the right of presenting to the House of Commons a justificatory paper to accompany a Report made against his conduct. But, times are changed! The doctrine above cited was the doctrine of 1782. It was the doctrine of those days when the pure virgin star first made its appearance in the political horizon I feel an uncommon degree of pleasure in looking back at those times of maiden modesty and innocence. Hence it was that I fell upon the admirable passage, which I have chosen as a motto for the present sheet; and, I beseech the reader to bear with me, while I further indulge in the delightful task of making some further extracts from the speeches of the same immaculate personage. I will begin with his very first speech. The subject was the retrenchment of the expenses of the civil list; for, next to *liberty* and *purity*, economy was his favourite topic. "It is the immediate duty of the Commons House of Parliament to guard the liberties, the lives, and the properties of the people. The last obligation is the strongest; it is more immediately incumbent upon them to guard the properties, because they are more liable to invasion by the secret and subtle attacks of influence, than either their lives or their liberties. It will be no diminution of true grandeur to yield to the respectful petitions of the people. The *tutelage* of this House may be a hard term; but it cannot be disgraceful to a *constitutional* king. Magnificence is not inconsistent with economy, but, on the contrary, in a time of necessity, and of common exertion, solid grandeur is dependent on the reduction of expense; and, it is the general sentiment that economy is, at this time, essentially necessary to national salvation."——I will not stop here to ask whether this speech, which

---

tation to them that any thing has been omitted on our part, that any misunderstanding or error had occurred, and that a further inquiry is advisable upon these or any other grounds, it would be for them to direct such further inquiry, and to decide by whom, and in what manner, it should be prosecuted; but, in the present circumstances, it appears to us that we cannot with propriety resume it.——We have the honour to be, my lord, your lordship's most obedient humble servants,—(*Signed*) CH. M. POLE, EWAN LAW, JOHN FORD, H. NICHOLLS, W. MACKWORTH PRAED.

was made in Feb. 1801, was remembered last July, when an immense addition was made to the grants for the Civil List, and when an addition of 1,500l. a year was made to Lord Melville's salary for the sinecure place of keeper of the signet.——The next speech I shall quote from was the second he made. It was upon the subject of *a Board of Commissioners* of Accounts, and on the 31st March, 1801.——"What is it that "gives the House of Commons it's im- "portance? What but the power of the "purse? Every branch of the legislature "has something to distinguish it, and that "which at once gives the character and "elevation of the Commons House of "Parliament, is, that they hold the "strings of the national purse, and are "entrusted with the great and important "power, first of granting the money, and "then of correcting the expenditure..... "How humiliating, how miserable a picture "of parliamentary power is it now wished "to be exhibited! So, then, all the power "of parliament, with respect to the allevia- "tion of national burdens, the redress of "grievances, the reform of expense, the "economy, the system, the elucidation of "office, is sunk into a disgraceful negative! "One positive power, indeed, remains; *the "odious power of taxing the people*, whenever "the minister thinks proper. The odious "power of making them pay for his *wild "schemes* and *lavish corruption*..... Bravo! But, let us take breath a little, for there is something still better coming..... "The minister has disregarded the report "of the Commissioners, a report *delivered "in upon oath*, and having all the facts sta- "ted in it ascertained upon the oaths of a "variety of witnesses, and has preferred the "loose conversation of a public board, *suf- "fering them to become the unsworn witnesses "in their own cause!*.....And, here I "must remark, and I verily believe it, on "my *credit*, my *honour*, and my *conscience*, "that the minister means and designs, that "the Commissioners shall spend their time "in *inquiring into trifles*, without going into "an examination of any great, extensive, "and important object, the better *to con- "tinue the deception*, and to carry on the *hy- "pocrisy* and *deceit* that have already led "the House into so many votes disgraceful "to themselves and ruinous to the public. "..... I earnestly conjure the House to "use their own eyes, and to consult their "own understandings; to return to a sense "of their duty to the people; to act like *ho- "nest* independent members of parliament, "and no longer implicitly *pin their faith* "upon the sleeve of a minister, whose sole "object it is to *deceive* and *mislead* just as "*best answers his purpose*."——With lan- guage and professions like these it was that he began his career; that he gained the confi- dence of the people of England; that he be- came prime minister of the crown, and that he seated himself so firmly as to be able to set all his opponents at defiance. At a moment of more leisure, I shall, probably, trace him onwards from the year 1782, under the title of the "PATRIOT'S PROGRESS;" which, I am inclined to think will bear no very faint resemblance to the "Progress of Love." For the present, I must leave the reader to the assistance of his own memory, which will, doubtless, furnish him with an abun- dance of facts applicable to the present scene of things.——I shall conclude with begging the reader's attention to one short remark upon a passage from the memorable Adding- tonian pamphlet by the "NEAR OBSERVER." That writer attributed to the *New Opposition* the clamours against the inquiry instituted to reform abuses. "The insurrection of job- "bers in the dock yards," says he, "was "*abetted* and *defended*, and the rebellion of "boards and departments *encouraged and "promoted*." I have once before denied this, as far as relates to persons *in the opposition*, and I now deny it again. My work was regarded as an *opposition print*; and I defy any one to point out a single sentence of my writing defending any jobber, or other suspected person; or, in anywise blaming Lord St. Vincent for his endeavours to bring them to justice. The letters of several corres- pondents having, perhaps, such an object in view, were published by me; but I am sure my readers will recollect, not only that I was always ready to admit, but that I *ac- tually did admit*, several very long articles on the other side. Indeed, I never, in any single instance, refused admittance to an ar- ticle sent me in defence of any part of the administration of Lord St. Vincent. And, as to the members of the opposition, we shall now have an opportunity of comparing their sentiments, and what is more, their *conduct*, with that of the persons, who took so much credit with the country for having instituted the Board of Naval Inquiry. *All* public men are now upon their *trial*; the whole nation are the spectators, and are waiting most anxiously for the result..... [Several other subjects, the ELEVENTH RE- PORT, the Affairs in the WEST-INDIES, &c. &c. would claim attention; but, till we see what we have in future to expect as to mat- ters like that which now fills the minds of all men, all other concerns are, comparatively, of little moment.]

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Bow-Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.